



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,006	07/25/2000	Amir Herzberg	6727/OH449	7174

7590 09/09/2003

S Peter Ludwig  
Darby & Darby P C  
805 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ABDI, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/625,006

Applicant(s)

HERZBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Abdi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9,11-20 and 23-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,9,11-20 and 23-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3621

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.
2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.
  - Claims 1, 4, 15, 24, 27, 30, and 33 are amended.
  - Claims 1-6, 9, 11-20, and 23-35 have been considered.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11 August 2003 has been entered.

#### ***Remarks***

4. The examiner would like to clarify any possible misunderstanding by the applicant's representative during the last interview on 21 July 2003. Examiner would like to clarify its position once more as it was discussed during the interview regarding the attorney Colb's position that the prior art of record allegedly does not show multiple aliases being used to hide the same address of the same item for additional advertising sites or affiliates. It should be noted contrary to applicant's statement in the remarks section of the amendment filed on 11 August 2003, no understanding was reached on the allowability of subject matter of "multiple aliases to identify different advertisers" as it was discussed in the interview. No agreement was reached on the allowability of any of the claims or what was discussed in the interview. Examiner would like to clarify that it was merely stated "what would make the applicant's invention different than the prior art of the record?" and the response by applicant's representative was the "multiple aliases to identify advertisers". This did not in any way mean that the examiner relinquishes the fact that the subject matter is not patentable as it has been presented at the time of the interview and what it was

Art Unit: 3621

proposed by the applicant's representative in the way of amending the claims accordingly. Examiner believes that the prior art of record teaches the same. As it is clear by the interview summary no agreements were reached and the examiner only stated that once new amendments have been filed by the applicant and has been entered into the record, the examiner would further examine the amended claims and consider the new amended claims based on their merits. Therefore, there will be further search and interpretation of both prior art in light of the new amended claims. Examiner would like to extend its appreciation for the applicant's amendment in the claims for further clarifying the objectives of the inventive steps as it was discussed in the previous interviews either on the phone or in person to further expeditious prosecution of the application.

***Response to Amendment***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 33, and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1-6, 9, 11-20, and 23-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,991,740 to Stephen Dale Messer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,917 to Timothy P. Barber.

8. As per claims 1, 24, and 30, an apparatus, method, and software for electronic advertising, comprising:

providing a plurality of different aliases to represent a network address of an item offered by a merchant for sale on a page per fee basis at a predetermined process, all of the plurality of aliases

Art Unit: 3621

representing the same network address (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27);

assigning respective aliases from among the plurality of different aliases to a plurality of advertisers for use by the advertisers in advertising the item and in receiving payment for the sale of the item, such that each respective alias from among the plurality of aliases is assigned by the merchant to specifically identify a respective one of the plurality of advertisers;

Posting an advertisement offering the item to a buyer for purchase via a network link represented in the advertisement by the respective alias, which conceals the network address from the buyer (See Messer col. 5, ln. 4-33, and col. 8, ln. 44-68, and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43);

Receiving an invocation of the link from the buyer;

Responsive to the invocation, transmitting an order to the merchant for supply of the item to the buyer in exchange for payment of the price by the buyer, the order comprising a message including the respective alias (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 6B, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27);

Conveying the item, responsive to the order, from the merchant to the buyer (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27); and

Receiving, responsively to the respective alias, a predefined portion of the price paid by the buyer in consideration for positing the advertisement (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27).

9. What Messer does not explicitly discuss is a network address represented in the advertisement by an alias, which conceals the network address from the buyer. However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system to hide a URL from the user and providing access to the desired location by utilizing an alias (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-47). This alias is used to clearly conceal the location of the item from the user. In table 2 of Barber it is clear that steps are taken to create an alias for

Art Unit: 3621

the item that is being advertised on the advertiser's site. This alias is unique to that particular advertiser and directs the end user to the same location as any other advertiser would be directed to access the same item of purchase or view (plurality of aliases as different advertiser sites are involved and the aliases would represent the same address for the same item). It is clear that multiple advertisers are intended to use this system (See Barber column 7, ln. 59-68). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated. In addition it would be inherent to have the multiple aliases, because one would not be able to use the same alias for the other advertising sites other than the same advertising site.

10. As per claims 15, 27, and 33, an apparatus, method, and software for electronic commerce by a merchant, comprising:

offering an item for purchase by a buyer on a page per fee basis at a predetermined price via a network link (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27);

providing a plurality of different aliases to represent a network address of an item offered by a merchant for sale on a page per fee basis at a predetermined price, all of the plurality of aliases representing the same network address (See Messer col. 5, ln. 4-33, and col. 8, ln. 44-68, and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43);

assigning a respective alias to each of plurality of different advertisers, from among the plurality of different aliases, such that each of the plurality of aliases is assigned to specifically identify a respective advertiser among the plurality of advertisers for use by the advertiser in receiving payment for a sale of the item;

defining terms for advertising, in accordance with which an advertiser posts an advertisement for the item, the advertisement containing the alias, which serves as a reference to the network link while

Art Unit: 3621

concealing the network link from the buyer (See Messer col. 5, ln. 4-33, and col. 8, ln. 44-68, and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43);

receiving from the advertiser among the plurality of different advertisers an order for supply of the item to the buyer responsive to invocation of the link in the advertisement by the buyer, the order comprising a message including the respective alias;

conveying the item, responsive to the order, via the advertiser to the buyer (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27); and

receiving payment from the buyer for the item, while a predefined portion of the price is paid to the advertiser, responsively to the respective alias, in consideration for posting the advertisement, in accordance with the terms of advertising (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68, and Barber abstract, col. 1, ln. 43-68, and col. 2, ln. 1-42, col. 5, ln. 1-43, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27).

11. What Messer does not explicitly discuss is a network address represented in the advertisement by an alias, which conceals the network address from the buyer. However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system to hide a URL from the user and providing access to the desired location by utilizing an alias (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-47). This alias is used to clearly conceal the location of the item from the user. In table 2 of Barber it is clear that steps are taken to create an alias for the item that is being advertised on the advertiser's site. This alias is unique to that particular advertiser and directs the end user to the same location as any other advertiser would be directed to access the same item of purchase or view (plurality of aliases as different advertiser sites are involved and the aliases would represent the same address for the same item). It is clear that multiple advertisers are intended to use this system (See Barber column 7, ln. 59-68). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated. In addition it

Art Unit: 3621

would be inherent to have the multiple aliases, because one would not be able to use the same alias for the other advertising sites other than the same advertising site.

12. As for claims 2, 25, and 31 Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 1, 24, and 30, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that the posting the advertisement comprises displaying the advertisement on a Web site maintained by the advertiser and accessible to the buyer via the Internet, and wherein receiving the invocation comprises receiving an indication that the buyer has selected the link (See Messer col. 5, ln. 4-33, and col. 8, ln. 44-68, and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43).

13. As for claims 3, 17, 26, 29, 32 and 35 Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 2, 16, 25, 28, 31, and 35 further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that the transmitting the order comprises transmitting the order in exchange for a payment made from the buyer to the merchant (See Messer col. 9, ln. 1-55 and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43). In addition, it is clear that Barber's system and method is proposing a "Micro Payment" system that is utilized to make transactions that are very small as well as it could be used for other types of transactions. Additionally, the fact the transaction involved is based on a micro payment or any other type of payment does effect any part of the systems operations.

14. As for claims 4 and 18, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 3 and 17, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that responsive to the micro payment and to the respective alias, a billing server transfers a credit to the merchant, and wherein receiving the predefined portion of the price comprises receiving from the billing server a portion of the payment (See Messer col. 9, ln. 1-55 and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-43). In addition, it is clear that Barber's system and method is proposing a "Micro Payment" system that is utilized to make transactions that are very small as well as it could be used for other types of transactions. Additionally, the fact the transaction involved is based on a micro payment or any other type of payment does effect any part of the systems operations.



Art Unit: 3621

15. As for claims 5 and 19, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 3 and 17, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that receiving the predefined portion of the price comprises receiving from the merchant a portion of the payment (See Messer col. 9, In. 1-55 and Barber col. 5, In. 1-43). In addition, it is clear that Barber's system and method is proposing a "Micro Payment" system that is utilized to make transactions that are very small as well as it could be used for other types of transactions. Additionally, the fact the transaction involved is based on a micro payment or any other type of payment does effect any part of the systems operations.

16. As for claim 6, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 2, further;

What Messer is not clear or explicit on conveying the item comprises allowing the buyer to access one or more Web pages of the merchant (See Messer col. 4, In. 47-59). However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system to allowing the buyer to access one or more Web pages of the merchant once the user has fulfilled the transaction obligation related to viewing that particular merchants offering (See Barber col. 5, In. 1-43, col. 7, In. 23-68, and col. 8, In. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to direct a user to the destination web page after transaction has successfully completed and providing access to the final destination desired by the user.

17. As for claim 7, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

What Messer is not clear or explicit on is that alias assigned by the merchant to correspond to the item offered for purchase. However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system that merchant assigns an alias to correspond to the item offered for purchase (See Barber col. 7, In. 23-68, and col. 8, In. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to conceal the actual URL for preventing the user from directly accessing the destination page and achieve a more reliable and efficient processing

Art Unit: 3621

system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated.

18. As for claims 8 and 22, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 7 and 21, further;

What Messer is not clear or explicit on is that sending the communication comprises passing the alias (Concealed URL) from the advertiser to the merchant (See Messer col. 4, ln. 47-60 and col. 8, ln. 4-68). However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system that sending the communication comprises passing the alias (Concealed URL) from the advertiser to the merchant (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to conceal the actual URL for preventing the user from directly accessing the destination page and achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated.

19. As for claim 9, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 8, further;

What Messer is not clear or explicit on is that passing the alias (Coded, embedded, or concealed URL) comprises passing the alias (Coded, embedded, or concealed URL) in a coded form (See Messer col. 4, ln. 47-60). However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system that passing the alias (Coded, embedded, or concealed URL) is in a coded form (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to conceal the actual URL for preventing the user from directly accessing the destination page and achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated.

Art Unit: 3621

20. As for claim 10, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

What Messer is not clear or explicit on is that the alias is assigned by the merchant to correspond specifically to the advertiser, among a plurality of advertisers who post the advertisement. However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system that the alias is assigned by the merchant to correspond specifically to the advertiser, (See Barber col. 4, ln. 3-48, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to conceal the actual URL for preventing the user from directly accessing the destination page and achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated. In addition, merchants have to be able to identify the web page the user is coming from by the means of assigning identifying parameters to the concealed URLs for each advertising web site to be able to keep track of user's originating site for further compensation for the referral fees due to the advertising web site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to assign identifier parameters to the URLs.

21. As for claim 11, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that transmitting the order comprises sending a communication from the advertiser to the merchant including an identifying code issued to the advertiser by the merchant (See Messer col. 4, ln. 47-60 and Barber col. 4, ln. 3-48, col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27).

22. As for claim 12, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that transmitting the order comprises making a record of the order for use in verifying that the predefined portion of the price is paid to the advertiser by the merchant (See Messer col. 9, ln. 21-26 and Barber col. 5, ln. 1-68)

Art Unit: 3621

23. As for claim 13, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

Messer clearly teaches posting the advertisement comprises posting the advertisement in accordance with advertising terms published by the merchant, and wherein receiving the predefined portion of the price comprises receiving the portion as specified by the advertising terms (See Messer col. 6, ln. 1-68, col. 7, ln. 1-68, col. 8, ln. 1-68, and col. 9, ln. 1-55).

24. As for claim 14, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 13, further;

Messer clearly teaches transmitting the order comprises submitting, along with the order, a coded reference to the advertising terms (See Messer col. 8, ln. 4-68).

25. As for claims 16, 28, and 34, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 15, 27, and 33, further;

Both Messer and Barber clearly teach that the offering the item for purchase comprises offering the item on a Web page of a Web site maintained by the merchant and accessible via the Internet, and wherein conveying the order comprises granting the buyer access to the Web page (See Messer col. 4, ln. 25-68 and col. 5, ln. 1-33 and Barber col. 3, ln. 26, col. 4, ln. 1-48, and col. 5, ln. 1-68).

26. As for claims 20, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 16, further;

Messer clearly teaches that the defining the terms for advertising comprises defining terms according to which the advertisement is displayed on a Web site of the advertiser (See Messer col. 7, ln. 1-68, col. 8, ln. 1-68, and col. 9, ln. 1-63).

27. As for claims 21, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claims 15, further;

Messer does not explicitly discuss is defining the terms for advertising comprises assigning an alias to serve as the reference to the network link in the advertisement, so as to conceal the network address from the buyer (See Messer abstract figure 1, 2, 6A and 6B, col. 5, ln. 4-33, and 7, col.3, ln. 1-68). However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system to hide a URL from the user and providing

Art Unit: 3621

access to the desired location by utilizing an alias (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated.

28. As for claim 23, Messer and Barber disclose, all the limitations of claim 15, further; What Messer is not clear or explicit on is that defining the terms for advertising comprises issuing an identifying code to the advertiser, and wherein receiving the order comprises receiving a message including the code. (See Messer col. 4, ln. 47-60). However, Barber clearly teaches the method and system that passing the alias (Coded, embedded, or concealed URL) is in a coded form (See Barber col. 7, ln. 23-68, and col. 8, ln. 1-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to conceal the actual URL for preventing the user from directly accessing the destination page and achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for preventing a user to circumvent the click through that is required for the advertising web site to be compensated. In addition, merchants have to be able to identify the web page the user is coming from by the means of assigning identifying parameters to the concealed URLs for each advertising web site to be able to keep track of user's originating site for further compensation for the referral fees due to the advertising web site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to assign identifier parameters to the URLs.

### ***Conclusion***

29. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response,

Art Unit: 3621

to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

31. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Abdi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3364. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

33. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:


(703) 872-9306 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 746-7749 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

**Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive  
7th floor receptionist, Arlington, VA, 22202**

Abdi/K  
September 2, 2003

  
**JOHN W. HAYES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**